REMARKS

Response to Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The following issue is presented: Whether claims 1-3, 5, 7-14, 16-19 and 21-32 are anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) by Aslam et al (Aslam, Javed; Pelekhov, Katya; Rus, Daniela; Static and Dynamic Information Organization with Star Clusters, 1998, Department of Computer Science, Dartmouth College, Hanover, NH, 10 pages)? If examination at the initial stage does not produce a prima facie case of unpatentability, then without more, the applicant is entitled to the grant of the patent. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F. 2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). Under 35 U.S.C. § 102, anticipation requires that there is no difference between the claimed invention and reference disclosure, as viewed by a person of ordinary skill in the field of the invention. See *Scripps Clinic & Research Foundation v. Genentech, Inc.*, 927 F.2d 1565. Anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim. In deciding the issue of anticipation, the trier of fact must identify the elements of the claims, determine their meaning in light of the specification and prosecution history, and identify corresponding elements disclosed in the allegedly anticipating reference. *See Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co.*, 730 F.2d 1452.

In the present case, the Office asserts that Applicants' claims 1-3, 5, 7-14, 16-19 and 21-32 are set forth in Aslam. As more fully set forth below, Applicants contend that the findings on anticipation by the Office are clearly erroneous based on a failure to identify the elements of the claims, to determine their meaning in light of the specification, and to identify corresponding elements disclosed in the allegedly anticipating reference of Aslam. Applicants contend that the Office has not shown the presence in a single prior

art reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim. Therefore, the rejection of these claims should be withdrawn.

It should be noted that the differences between Applicants' invention and the Aslam reference arise from the fact that the Applicants' claimed invention relies on the unique features of a similarity search engine, incorporated into Applicants' invention by reference, for determining similarity relationships between source and target documents located in remote disparate databases. The similarity search engine makes use of search agents that may be located in remote disparate databases for determining document attribute scoring. The remote search agents, or user defined functions, reside in the database management systems and determine similarity relationships between documents by use of deterministic (as opposed to statistical or probabilistic) algorithms. These algorithms determine leaf node similarities using designated measure algorithms, sum up intermediate node similarities using weighting algorithms, and aggregate document level similarity scores using choice algorithms. It is therefore only necessary to transmit the similarity search scores from remote disparate databases to a similarity search server, without the necessity of transmitting entire source and target documents from the remote disparate databases to the similarity search server. The Aslam reference discloses a method that relies on a probabilistic (as opposed to a deterministic) star clustering algorithm that is based graph theory, and particularly a similarity graph, for determining relationships between clusters of information. There is no teaching in Aslam of determining similarity scores between source and target documents by a similarity search server and associated remote similarity search agents. Since the Office has failed to establish that there is no difference between the Applicants' claimed invention and the reference of Aslam, the Applicants requests

withdrawal of the rejections and reconsideration of the patent with respect to the above-referenced claims.

Claim Rejections of Independent Claims 1, 17 and 29 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

While there may be similarities between the result produced by Applicants' claimed invention and the result produced by the method disclosed in the Aslam reference, the method used between the initiation and result of the two disclosures are patentably distinct from one another. That is, the means of accomplishing the result in the two disclosures are distinguishable from one another. This is evidenced by the fact that every element of Applicants claimed invention, arranged as in the claims, is not found in the Aslam reference cited by the Office.

Preamble: Turning to the preamble of Applicants' independent claim 1, as amended, and similar independent claims 17 and 29, as amended, which recite, a method or system "for automatically analyzing relationships between target and source documents…" There is no teaching in Aslam of automatically analyzing relationships between target and source documents. The cited passage by the Office of p 2, col.1 line 58 through p. 2 col.2 line 2 of Aslam teaches a post processor that classifies data into clusters that capture topic categories and subcategories, and an on-line algorithm for constructing self-organizing information systems, for routing problems, for topic detection, and for topic tracking. There is no relevance between this citation from Aslam and the preamble of Applicants' claims 1, 17 and 29, and there is no relationship of these cited post processor and on-line algorithm functions to any functions in Applicants' disclosure. There is no teaching in this citation of the preamble of Applicants' claims 1, 17 and 29.

First Claim Limitation: Turning to the first limitation of Applicants' independent claim 1, as amended, and similar independent claims 17 and 29, as amended, which recite, "receiving an autolink command by a link analysis server from an application program". There is no teaching in Aslam of receiving an autolink command by a link analysis server. The cited passage by the Office of p 4, col. 2 line 7 through p. 5 col.1 line 3 of Aslam teaches using a "Smart" search engine to compute a document to document similarity matrix for a set of retrieved documents, the similarity matrix being used to compute clusters and to visualize clusters. There is no relevance between this Aslam citation and Applicants' claims 1, 17 and 29, and there is no relationship of the cited "Smart" search engine, similarity matrix, or computing and visualizing clusters to any functions in Applicants' disclosure. There is no teaching in this Office citation of the first limitation of Applicants' claims 1, 17 and 29. Therefore, there is no anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and Applicants request that the claim rejection be withdrawn.

Second Claim Limitation: Turning to the second limitation of Applicants' independent claim 1, as amended, and similar independent claims 17 and 29, as amended, which recite, "accessing a processing profile identified in the autolink command". There is no teaching in Aslam of accessing a processing profile identified in an autolink command. The cited passage by the Office of p 5, col.1 lines 1-3 of Aslam teaches allowing users to input queries by typing free text, while having a choice of specifying several corpora. There is no relevance between this citation and Applicants' claims 1, 17 and 29, and there is no relationship of user input queries, typing free text, or choosing from several corpora to any functions in Applicants' disclosure. There is no teaching in this citation of the second limitation of Applicants' claims 1, 17 and 29. Therefore, there is no

anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and Applicants request that the claim rejection be withdrawn.

Third Claim Limitation: Turning to the third limitation of Applicants' independent claim 1, as amended, and similar independent claims 17 and 29, as amended, which recite, "accessing source and target document data identified in the autolink command". There is no teaching in Aslam of accessing source and target document data in an autolink command. The cited passage by the Office of p 5, col.1 lines 2-3 of Aslam teaches users having a choice of specifying several corpora. There is no relevance between this citation and Applicants' claims 1, 17 and 29, and there is no relationship of choosing from several corpora to any functions in Applicants' disclosure. There is no teaching in this citation of the third limitation of Applicants' claims 1, 17 and 29. Therefore, there is no anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and Applicants request that the claim rejection be withdrawn.

Fourth Claim Limitation: Turning to the fourth limitation of Applicants' independent claim 1, as amended, and similar independent claims 17 and 29, as amended, which recite, "determining similarity scores between the source and target documents by a similarity search server and associated remote similarity search agents". There is no teaching in Aslam of determining similarity scores between the source and target documents by a similarity search server and associated remote similarity search agents. There is no teaching Aslam of the fourth limitation of Applicants' claims 1, 17 and 29. Therefore, there is no anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and Applicants request that the claim rejection be withdrawn.

Fifth Claim Limitation: Turning to the fifth limitation of Applicants' independent claim 1, as amended, and similar independent claims 17 and 29, as amended, which recite,

"performing a link analysis for identifying the relationships based on comparing the similarity scores between the target and source documents". There is no teaching in Aslam of performing a link analysis for identifying the relationships based on comparing the similarity scores between the target and source documents. The cited passage by the Office of p 5, col.1 lines 6-9 of Aslam teaches invoking the "Smart" system to produce a ranked list of the most relevant documents, their titles, locations and document to document similarity information. There is no relevance between this citation and Applicants' claims 1, 17 and 29, and there is no teaching in this citation of identifying relationships based on comparing similarity scores. There is no teaching in this citation of the fifth limitation of Applicants' claims 1, 17 and 29. Therefore, there is no anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and Applicants request that the claim rejection be withdrawn.

Sixth Claim Limitation: Turning to the sixth limitation of Applicants' independent claim 1, as amended, and similar independent claims 17 and 29, as amended, which recite, "sending a response containing a link analysis result identifying the relationships to the application program". There is no teaching in Aslam of sending a link analysis result for identifying relationships to an application program. The cited passage by the Office of p 5, col.1 lines 6-9 of Aslam teaches invoking the "Smart" system to produce a ranked list of the most relevant documents, their titles, locations and document to document similarity information. There is no relevance between this citation and Applicants' claims 1, 17 and 29, and there is no teaching in this citation of identifying relationships based on comparing similarity scores. There is no teaching in this citation of the sixth limitation of Applicants' claims 1, 17 and 29. Therefore, there is no

anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and Applicants request that the claim rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections of Dependent Claims 2-16, 18-28, and 30-36 Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(b) and 103(a)

Applicants' dependent claims 2-16, 33 and 34 depend on independent 1, applicants dependent claims 18-28, 35 and 36 depend on independent claim 17, and dependent claims 30-32 depend on independent claim 29. These dependent claims incorporate all the limitations of independent claims 1, 17 and 29 upon which they depend while providing further unique and non-obvious recitations. Since the Office has not established a *prima facie* case of anticipation for independent claims 1, 17 and 29, a *prima facie* case of anticipation and obviousness has also not been established for dependent claims 2-16, 18-28, and 30-36. Since the rejections of claims 1, 17 and 29 are not supported by the Aslam reference, the rejections of these dependent claims as being anticipated or obvious are also not supported by the Aslam, Apte and Lam references and should be withdrawn. Applicants' request withdrawal of the rejections of these claims, and further examination and allowance of these dependent claims.

In addition, concerning claims 2 and 18, there is no teaching in the Aslam reference of receiving an autolink command by a link analysis server from a user interface program connected to the link analysis server. Concerning claims 3 and 23, there is no teaching in the Aslam reference of a processing profile further comprising identifying an options element, identifying a threshold limit element defining a path to threshold limit values, identifying a mapping element for defining mappings between source and target document data, identifying an output element for defining output attributes including detail level 1, detail level 2, detail level 3, detail level 4, persistence

level 1, persistence level 2, persistence level 3, and persistence level 4, and identifying a datasource element for defining a persistence data source. Concerning claim 4, there is no teaching in the Aslam or Apte references of identifying an options element that further comprises specifying a stop-on-count attribute, specifying an analysis-type attribute, including single, multiple and group values, specifying a count-type attribute, including match-count, statistical and threshold, specifying a minimum and maximum number of document links to be found, specifying threshold limits for defining ranges of similarity scores for indicating linked relationships, including attributes greater-than, greater-than-and-equal-to, less-than, less-than-and-equal-to, equal-to, and not-equal-to, and specifying scoring aggregation options, including attributes include-minimum, include-maximum, and average-top-N-scores. Concerning claims 5 and 19, there is no teaching in the Aslam reference of accessing a processing profile that comprises accessing a processing profile embedded inline in the autolink command. Concerning claims 6 and 20, there is no teaching in the Aslam or Lam references of a processing profile that comprises accessing a processing profile from a persistence database. Concerning claim 7, there is no teaching in the Aslam reference of the source document data comprising an inline designation attribute, one or more source document key attributes, a no-source attribute for indicating target documents are compared to each other, a query attribute, a database attribute, a cache designation attribute, and a block size attribute. Concerning claim 8, there is no teaching in the Aslam reference of accessing source document data embedded inline in the autolink command. Concerning claim 9, there is no teaching in the Aslam reference of accessing source document data from a similarity search server by issuing a query command to the similarity search server from the link analysis server. Concerning claim 10, there is no

teaching in Aslam of the target document data comprising an inline designation attribute, one or more source document key attributes, a query attribute, a database attribute, a cache designation attribute, and a block size attribute. Concerning claim 11, there is no teaching in the Aslam reference of accessing target document data embedded inline in the autolink command. Concerning claim 12, there is no teaching in the Aslam reference of accessing target document data from a similarity search server by issuing a query command to the similarity search server from the link analysis server. Concerning claim 13, there is no teaching in the Aslam reference of performing a link analysis for identifying relationships based on a comparison selected from the group consisting of comparing one source document with many target documents, comparing multiple source documents with multiple target documents in different groups, and comparing multiple documents within a group with each other. Concerning claim 14, there is no teaching in the Aslam reference of sending a response selected from the group consisting of sending a response containing an error message, sending a response containing a count of link matches, sending a response containing a count of link matches and source documents, sending a response containing a count of link matches, source documents and document scores that were used in a link match result, and sending a response containing a count of link matches, source documents, document scores and document attribute scores that were used in a link match result. Concerning claim 15, there is no teaching in the Aslam or Lam references of storing the response containing the link analysis result in a persistence database. Concerning claim 16, there is no teaching in the Aslam reference of a computer-readable medium containing instructions for controlling a computer system according to the software method of claim 1. Concerning claim 21, there is no teaching in the Aslam reference of

the source document data being accessed from a similarity search server. Concerning claim 22, there is no teaching in the Aslam reference of the target data being accessed from a similarity search server. Concerning claim 24, there is no teaching in the Aslam reference of receiving an autolink command by an input processing section of the link analysis server. Concerning claim 25, there is no teaching in the Aslam reference of accessing the processing profile, the source document data and the target document data by a data manager section of the link analysis server. Concerning claim 26, there is no teaching in the Aslam reference of a link analysis engine for performing a link analysis that comprises an engine manager section containing an engine core within the link analysis section. Concerning claim 27, there is no teaching in the Aslam reference of sending a response by an output section of the link analysis server. Concerning claim 28, there is no teaching in the Aslam reference of a data persistence section of the link analysis server for storing response results. Concerning claim 30, there is no teaching in the Aslam reference of a processing profile embedded inline in the autolink command. Concerning claim 31, there is no teaching in the Aslam reference of target document attributes and associated schema embedded inline in the autolink command. Concerning claim 32, there is no teaching in the Aslam reference of source document attributes and associated schema embedded inline in the autolink command. Concerning claim 33, there is no teaching in the Aslam, Apte or Lam references of locating the target documents and the remote similarity search agents in one or more remote disparate databases, determining similarity search scores between the source documents and the target documents by the remote similarity search agents using measurement and comparison functions, and transmitting the similarity search scores from the one or more remote disparate databases to the similarity search server.

Concerning claim 34, there is no teaching in the Aslam, Apte or Lam references of locating the source documents in the one or more remote disparate databases. Concerning claim 35, there is no teaching in the Aslam, Apte or Lam references of means for locating the target documents and the remote similarity search agents in one or more remote disparate databases, remote similarity search agents for determining similarity search scores between the source documents and the target documents using measurement and comparison functions, and means for transmitting the similarity search scores from the one or more remote disparate databases to the similarity search server. Concerning claim 36, there is no teaching in the Aslam, Apte or Lam references of means for locating the source documents in the one or more remote disparate databases.

Since the references cited by the Office do not teach the limitations of Applicants' dependent claims, the rejections of these dependent claims as being anticipated or obvious are also not supported by the Aslam, Apte and Lam references and should be withdrawn. Applicants' request withdrawal of the rejections of these claims, and further examination and allowance of these dependent claims.

Applicants contend that, based on the claim amendments, there are patentably distinguishable claimed features between the invention represented by Applicants' claims and the cited reference disclosures of Aslam, Apte and Lam.

SUMMARY

As discussed above, the rejections of claims 1-36, as amended, under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(b) and 103(a) are not supported by the references cited by the Office. Reconsideration and further examination are requested.

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is requested that the Examiner telephone Douglas D. Russell, Applicants' Attorney at 512-338-4601 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

For these reasons, and in view of the above amendments, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

April 27, 2007
Date

/Douglas D. Russell/
Douglas D. Russell, Reg. No. 40152
Attorney for Applicant

Taylor Russell & Russell, P.C.
4807 Spicewood Springs Road
Building Two, Suite 250
Austin, TX 78759
Tel. 512-338-4601
Fax 512-338-4651
drussell@russell-law.com

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX A